

## REMARKS

This Response addresses the issues raised by the Examiner in the Office Action mailed August 12, 2005. Initially, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given this case. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicant believes that all outstanding issues have been addressed and prompt allowance of all remaining claims is respectfully requested.

### Interview Summary

Applicant again respectfully thanks the Examiner for his consideration during the October 5, 2005 and October 11, 2005 telephone interviews. To review, during the October 11, 2005 discussion, Applicant proposed further amendments to claim 1, which the Examiner kindly found to be distinguishable over the prior art. However, the Examiner also stated during that discussion that such amendments would require further consideration and searching if and when officially filed, in view of the final rejection status of the above-referenced application.

### Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 6, 7, 13, 14 and 16-21 currently stand for consideration, wherein claims 2-5, 8-12 and 15 are being amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject invention, and new claims 16-21 are being submitted for consideration. All amendments to the claims are fully supported in the specification, including at page 10, lines 2-6 describing an “angle adjusting mechanism”, and at page 6, last paragraph (and at page 13, last 2 lines – page 14, first 2 lines) describing the “sandwiching force” and “pre-load” of the pickup and the rigid structure for imparting such forces.

In particular, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the term “rigid” relating to the sensor holding member, and a further limitation of an “angle-adjusting mechanism”. Such changes are fully supported by the specification at page 10, lines 2-6 describing an “angle adjusting mechanism”, and at page 6, last paragraph (and at page 13, last 2 lines – page 14, first 2 lines) describing the “sandwiching force” and “pre-load” of the pickup and the rigid structure for imparting such forces. Further, claim 6 has been amended to eliminate the unnecessary term “means”.

Claim 7 has been amended to further limit the structure of the rigid length-adjusting mechanism to a rotatable screw and receiving portion structure, as supported at pages page 13, last 2 lines – page 14, first 2 lines and by FIGS. 8-9 and 16-17. The amendments to claims 13 and 14 relating to the types of pianos in which the pickup apparatus is mounted is supported in the description at page 9, paragraphs 1-5 and FIGS. 1-3.

New claim 16 has been added to further describe the angle-adjusting mechanism, which is supported in the specification at page 10, lines 2-6. New claim 17 has been added to further claim the possibility of each of the length adjusting mechanism and the angle-adjusting mechanism being disposed at respective sides of the pickup apparatus (sensor holding member), as clearly described at page 12, last 5 lines – page 13, first 2 lines, and in FIGS. 8-9 and 16-17.

New claim 18 has been added to include the limitation of “at least two detachable electric signal output connectors” rotatable to a convenient position, which is mentioned in the specification at page 10, last line and in FIGS. 8-9 and 16-17, clearly showing at least two electric signal output connectors. New claims 19-21 essentially repeat the previously mentioned amendments, in a different dependency format.

Applicant submits that no new matter is being introduced into this application through the submission of this response.

#### Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 5-6, 10, and 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Jennings et al. (US 4,058,045).

Further, claims 3 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Jennings ‘045 in view Kitashima (US 6,087,574), and claims 7-9 were rejected over Jennings ‘045 in view of Pozar (US 4,242,937). Applicant respectfully traverses this basis for the above rejections.

As mentioned above, during the October 11, 2005 telephone interview, the Examiner essentially stated that the introduction of the terms “rigid” and “rigidly” to the claims effectively limited the present invention in a manner not taught by the spring mechanisms disclosed in Jennings or other cited references.

With such further limitations, and with the above-mentioned cancellations of various other claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the reasons for the previous rejections have been overcome, or that such reasons have now been rendered moot.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for his continued careful consideration of the present case. The subject invention, as presently amended, discloses a pickup apparatus having a rigid length adjusting mechanism and an angle-adjusting mechanism. Additionally, the length-adjusting mechanism may utilize a rotatable screw and receiving portion structure, where rotation of the screw achieves the length adjustment.

Furthermore, the sensor may include electric signal output connectors, spaced so that an output connector is always conveniently positioned, despite rotations of the screw (of the sensor holding member). The angle-adjusting mechanism may also involve a spherically rotatable, "pivoting" fulcrum structure, which can be fixed at the desired arbitrary angle via the length adjustment.

The cooperation of the rigid length adjusting mechanism and the angle-adjusting mechanism restrains or "suppresses" certain undesirable vibrations. Such vibrations may come from the sound source member, the pickup itself or other potential sources. By rigidly and forcibly holding the sensor with an appropriate load in this manner, one can achieve higher sound fidelity, and avoid introducing further vibrations to the sensor.

This rigid suppression of vibrations needs to occur regardless of the distance or angles from the sound source member to the stationery member. Furthermore, such a pickup apparatus needs to be easily mountable and detachable without incurring any damage to piano surfaces.

The claims in their present form disclose such important features of the present invention. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, in their present form, are allowable over any combination of the cited references. Having fully addressed any previous grounds of rejection, Applicant respectfully requests that the amendments be entered and a Notice of Allowance be issued.

### Conclusion

In view of all the above, Applicant respectfully submits that certain clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art references upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely. These differences are more than sufficient that the present invention as now claimed would not have been anticipated nor rendered obvious given the prior art. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher  
Registration Number 24,344

Juan Carlos A. Marquez  
Registration Number 34,072

**REED SMITH LLP**  
3110 Fairview Park Drive  
Suite 1400  
Falls Church, Virginia 22042  
(703) 641-4200

**January 12, 2006**